

# EXHIBIT 4

4:07



Rani &gt;



iMessage

Tue, Mar 19 at 3:37 PM

Hi Rani. This is Sujung.  
Pls call me asap. Thanks



I just got out with sheriff  
running to a meeting call  
you in a few minutes

The client was not re-  
leased to home deten-  
tion

Tue, Mar 19 at 5:40 PM

Yes but still need to set  
up EM right ? With a



iMessage



4:07



Rani &gt;



Tue, Mar 19 at 5:40 PM

Yes but still need to set up EM right ? With a monitor and set up correct ? So home check all that required I assume ? Again I think that talking would be good

Rani, but that rationale would apply to every EM case. The point of Tigar's injunction is that it can't be imposed on a blanket basis.

No use debating this between the two of us



iMessage



4:07



Rani &gt;



No use debating this between the two of us though!

Delivered

Then how is 4 th amendment not violated if we need to go into the home? You r correct I think EM should be used when it should be used and the justification for warrantless search should be articulated or maybe EM Not imposed. And you are assuming Tigar's injunction first is correctly rooted and sec-



iMessage



4:08



Rani &gt;



correctly rooted and second that it will be upheld. That being said the courts have choices and if they don't want EM then they should not order it but as we said this is what we need to actually implement the program. A private EM can go in someone's house no fourth amendment issue. A cop must have that right given by the court. So we are trying not to violate rights but you r right there is a difference in opinion.



iMessage

